

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 18-39V

(not to be published)

DEAN LESLIE,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: July 14, 2021

Special Processing Unit (SPU);  
Attorney's Fees and Costs

*Isaiah Richard Kalinowski, Maglio Christopher & Toale, PA, Washington, DC, for  
Petitioner.*

*Colleen Clemons Hartley, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for  
Respondent.*

### **DECISION ON ATTORNEY'S FEES AND COSTS<sup>1</sup>**

On January 8, 2018, Dean Leslie, M.D. filed a Petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*<sup>2</sup> (the "Vaccine Act"). Petitioner alleged that he suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration, a defined Table Injury, after receiving the influenza vaccine on September 30, 2016. (Petition at ¶¶ 1, 14, 17). On January 28, 2021, a decision was issued awarding compensation to Petitioner in the amount of \$131,321.86. (ECF No. 77).

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished Decision contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Decision will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

Petitioner has now filed a motion for attorney's fees and costs, dated June 14, 2021 (ECF No. 82), requesting an award of \$91,594.83 (representing \$89,875.80 in fees and \$1,719.03 in costs). In accordance with General Order No. 9, Petitioner filed a signed statement indicating that he incurred out-of-pocket expenses in the amount of \$866.99. (ECF No. 82-3). Respondent reacted to the motion on June 18, 2021, indicating that he is satisfied that the statutory requirements for an award of attorney's fees and costs are met in this case, but deferring resolution of the amount to be awarded to my discretion. (ECF No. 83). On June 18, 2021, Petitioner filed a reply requesting fees and costs be awarded in full. (ECF No. 84).

I have reviewed the billing records submitted with Petitioner's request. In my experience, the request appears reasonable, and I find no cause to reduce the requested hours or rates.

The Vaccine Act permits an award of reasonable attorney's fees and costs. Section 15(e). **Accordingly, Petitioner is awarded the total amount of \$92,461.82<sup>3</sup> as follows:**

- **A lump sum of \$91,594.83, representing reimbursement for attorneys' fees and costs, in the form of a check payable jointly to Petitioner and Petitioner's counsel; and**
- **A lump sum of \$866.99, representing reimbursement for Petitioner's costs, in the form of a check payable to Petitioner.**
- **Petitioner requests checks be forwarded to Maglio Christopher & Toale, PA, 1605 Main Street, Suite 710, Sarasota, Florida 34236.**

In the absence of a timely-filed motion for review (see Appendix B to the Rules of the Court), the Clerk shall enter judgment in accordance with this decision.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> This amount is intended to cover all legal expenses incurred in this matter. This award encompasses all charges by the attorney against a client, "advanced costs" as well as fees for legal services rendered. Furthermore, § 15(e)(3) prevents an attorney from charging or collecting fees (including costs) that would be in addition to the amount awarded herein. *See generally Beck v. Sec'y of Health & Human Servs.*, 924 F.2d 1029 (Fed. Cir.1991).

<sup>4</sup> Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), the parties may expedite entry of judgment by filing a joint notice renouncing their right to seek review.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

**s/Brian H. Corcoran**

Brian H. Corcoran  
Chief Special Master